

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the comments set forth fully below. Claims 1-52 were previously pending in this application. Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1-52 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1-52 have been amended. Claims 1-52 are now pending in this application.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent. No. 6,505,243 to Lortz (hereinafter "Lortz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,897 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Lortz teaches providing help information to a network-attached device. Within Lortz, it is taught that a connection notification is received for the network attachable device over a first data path. Device specific help information is retrieved for the network attachable device over a second data path and provided to a configuration interface. Lortz does not teach or suggest downloading or executing an interactive support service application to provide a remote interactive support service process for a selected device.

Lee teaches a customer support system that provides support for a consumer product using the Internet. Lee teaches providing a service menu on a service page as a support page for providing a product model guidance, the usage of various resources related to the consumer product and technical information relating to the consumer product. (Lee, col. 2, lines 52-56) Lee further teaches that the service page may also have a download page for downloading software related to the consumer product to the user computer via the Internet. (Lee, col. 2, lines 56-58) Lee teaches that the download page 320 is a module for downloading PC-related software desired by the user to a user computer when the user experiences a particular program during use of a PC, when the version of software currently being used is to be upgraded, or when

new application software is desired to be installed. (Lee, col. 5, lines 44-49) Lee does not teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. Accordingly, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device.

In contrast to the teachings of Lortz, Lee and their combination, the remote manual, maintenance and diagnostic services for networked electronic devices provides a process of identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices in a home network system. A client side process, executed by a client computing system in the home network, operates in conjunction with a server side process executed by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with the client computing system via the Internet. In one embodiment, the client computing system is implemented by a gateway device communicatively coupled with each of the electronic devices via the home network. The gateway device is operative to access the Internet and is communicatively coupled with a display unit. The interactive support service includes a remote interactive manual service providing educational instructions to a user of the home network system regarding operation of the selected device, a remote interactive maintenance/diagnostic service for instructing a home network system user in solving maintenance problems associated with the selected device, or a combination remote interactive manual/maintenance/diagnostic service. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server

computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device.

Within the specification of the present application, examples of interactive support service applications are provided. As described within the specification of the present application

FIG. 6 shows a block diagram generally illustrating an exemplary support service application GUI screen at 230 that is displayed by the service management system 92 (FIG. 1) on the display device 42 (FIG. 1) in response to activation by the user of the service/help button 220 (FIG. 5). The GUI screen 230 includes: a button 232 for initiating a remote interactive manual process for instructing the user regarding operation of the camcorder; a button 234 for initiating a remote interactive maintenance process for instructing the user in solving maintenance problems associated with the device; a button 236 for initiating a remote interactive diagnostic process for automatically diagnosing problems with the associated device; and a button 238 for initiating an integrated application process that provides for controlling the associated device and another selected one of the devices (e.g., a video editing process that utilizes and combines the functions of the camcorder 64 and digital video recorder 62 of FIG. 1). [Present Specification, page 14, lines 10-21, Figure 6]

Another example of an interactive support application is also described

FIG. 7 shows a block diagram generally illustrating a first exemplary support GUI screen at 240 provided by an interactive support service application 170 (FIG. 3) loaded by the service management system 92 in order to provide interactive remote supports for the camcorder 64 (FIG. 1). As further explained below, a support service process provided by the loaded application may include the steps of: communicating with the particular device via the home network in order to determine a current functional state of the particular device; determining diagnostic information based on the current functional state of the device, the diagnostic information indicating a problem or other information associated with operating of the device; and determining user instructional information based on

the current functional state of the device and/or the diagnostic information.  
[Present Specification, page 14, lines 22-31, Figure 7]

It is further taught within the specification of the present application that “each of the support service applications 170 (FIG. 3) may include instructions and data (e.g., text, and graphical images) for providing any type of interactive support for any type of consumer electronics device.” [Present Specification, page 15, lines 20-26] Neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading and executing such interactive support service applications.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a process of identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a gateway device communicatively coupled with each of the electronic devices via a home network, the gateway device being operative to access the Internet and being communicatively coupled with a display unit. The process of Claim 1 comprises determining device identification information associated with a selected one of the electronic devices for which a support service application is required, providing said device identification information to a selected server computing system via the Internet, downloading an interactive support service application associated with said selected device from the selected server computing system and executing said downloaded interactive support service application at the gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for said selected device. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 5, 8, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,788 to Kim et al. (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 5, 8, and 15 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 5, 8, and 15 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Kim and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,507 to Wookey (hereinafter “Wookey”). Claim 6 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 6 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter “Hemphill”). Claims 11 and 12 are both dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 11 and 12 are both also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 16, 17, 19-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device. Further, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based on the device identification.

The independent Claim 16 is directed to a service management software system for execution by a gateway device communicatively coupled with at least one electronic device via a home network, the software system for identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with each of the electronic devices. The service management software system of Claim 16 comprises a home network bridge supported by a platform for receiving device identification information associated with a selected one of the electronic devices for which a service application is required, a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based at least in part on said device identification information and an internet bridge supported by the platform and being responsive to receive said uniform resource locator from said service manager via the platform, and being operative to access a selected server computing system via the Internet using said uniform resource locator, and to download an interactive support service application associated with said selected device, wherein the platform is operative to dynamically load and unload support service applications. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device. Further, as described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based on the device identification. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 17, 19-21 and 24 are all dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their

combination. Accordingly, Claims 17, 19-21 and 24 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view Hemphill. Claim 18 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 18 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of Kim. Claim 22 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 22 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Kim and further in view of Wookey. Claim 23 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 23 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 25-27 and 29-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest providing the selected interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system which includes instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device.

The independent Claim 25 is directed to a process of identifying and providing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with at least one client computing system via the Internet. The process of Claim 25 comprises receiving device identification information from a client computing system, the device identification information indicating a particular consumer electronic device, accessing a selected interactive support service application associated with the particular device based on said device identification information and providing said selected interactive support service application associated with the particular device to the client computing system, said selected interactive support application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest providing the selected interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system which includes instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 26, 27 and 29-32 are all dependent on the independent Claim 25. As described above, the independent claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 26, 27 and 29-32 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 28 and 33-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Wookey and further in view of Kim. Claims 28 and 33-38 are all dependent on the independent Claim 25. As described above, the independent claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their

combination. Accordingly, Claims 28 and 33-38 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 39-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee, Kim and Wookey. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including a step of automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device. Further, neither Kim or Wookey teach or suggest providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service application including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device. Accordingly, neither Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey nor their combination teach providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device.

The independent Claim 39 is directed to a process of identifying and providing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with at least one client computing system via the Internet, the client computing system being communicatively coupled with at least one electronic device. The process of Claim 39 comprises receiving device identification information from the client computing system, the device identification

information indicating a particular consumer electronic device that is communicatively coupled with the client computing system, providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device, receiving diagnosis information from the client computing system, said diagnosis information indicating a diagnosed problem associated with the particular device that is determined as a result of execution of said instructions by the client computing system and creating a database record based on said diagnosis information and said device identification information, said record indicating said diagnosed problem associated with the particular device. As discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey nor their combination teach providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey and their combination.


Claims 40-52 are all dependent on the independent Claim 39. As described above, the independent claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 40-52 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

A copy of an Office Action issued by another Examiner on October 18, 2004, for a Co-pending Patent Application Serial No. 09/705,472, filed November 2, 2000 is included with this response.

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP


Dated: November 19, 2008

By:   
Jonathan O. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,902  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*July 2000*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,472	10/18/2004	Klaus Hofrichter	20381-18(50P3909)	6809

28960 7590 10/18/2004

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP  
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086


**COPY**


EXAMINER	
ZHONG, CHAD	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	



DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,472

Applicant(s)

HOFRICHTER ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 07/12/2004. This action has been made final.
2. Claims 1-29 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 07/12/2004: Claims 1-29 are amended.
3. The specification is objected to because of the following:  
current US patent policy does not permit the use of hyperlinks in the specification. Such links are directed to an Internet site, the contents of which are subject to change without notice. Therefore, the potential for inclusion of new matter would be a constant problem. See pages 11, 12, for example. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph***

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
  - i. the software system – claim 12

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2154

6. Claims 1-12, 14-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lortz, US 6,505,243.

7. As per claim 1, Lortz teaches a process of identifying and managing; service applications associated with electronic devices in a home network system, each device being communicatively coupled with a gateway device via the home network, the gateway device being operative to access an internet protocol network, comprising:

receiving device identification information associated with a particular one of the electronic devices in the home network for which a service application is required (Col. 6, lines 59-67), wherein the service application is directed to at least one of: remotely controlling the device, remotely diagnosing problems with the device, remotely performing maintenance functions on the device, and providing interoperability with another device (Col. 5, lines 15-45; Fig 3);

forming a uniform resource locator (URL) based at least on said device identification information (Col. 6, lines 39-50, lines 58-67);

accessing a server via the internet protocol network using said URL (Col. 6, lines 58-67); and  
downloading a service application that: is operative to provide a service associated with said particular device (Col. 6, lines 58-67).

8. As per claim 2, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing, services as recited in claim 1 wherein said device identification information includes associated vendor information indicative of a vendor of the particular device, and model information indicative of the model of the particular device (Col. 6, lines 2-8, lines 39-50, lines 58-67).

9. As per claim 3, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein said vendor identification information includes a vendor ID number, and wherein said model information includes a model number (Col. 6, lines 2-8, lines 39-50, lines 58-67).

Art Unit: 2154

10. As per claim 4, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein forming the URL comprises:

- determining a host name based on said vendor information;
- determining a file path based on said model information; and
- forming the URL based on said host name and said file path (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

11. As per claim 5, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing; services as recited in claim 2 wherein forming the URL comprises:

- determining a host name based on said vendor information; and
- forming the URL based at least in part on said host name (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

12. As per claim 6, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein forming a URL comprises:

- determining a file path based on said model information; and
- forming the URL based at least in part on said file path (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

13. As per claim 7, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein downloading the service comprises:

- determining a search key based on said device identification information; and
- querying said server using said search key for the service application associated with said particular device (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

14. As per claim 8, Lortz teaches a process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein:

- said step of forming a URL includes the steps of determining a host name based on said vendor information, and forming the URL based at least in part on said host name; and

Art Unit: 2154

said step of downloading a service includes the steps of determining a search key based on said model information, and querying said server using said search key for a service application associated with said particular device (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

15. As per claim 9, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 2 wherein:

forming the URL includes determining a host name based on said vendor information, and forming the URL based at least in part on said host name; and

downloading the service includes determining a search key based on said vendor information and model information, and querying said server using said search key for the service application associated with said particular device (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

16. As per claim 10, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing; services as recited in claim 1 further comprising:

dynamically loading said downloaded service application onto a platform at the gateway device (Col. 4, lines 63-65; Col. 8, lines 62-64); and

executing said downloaded service application (Col. 7, lines 1-6; Fig 3).

17. As per claim 11, Lortz teaches the process of identifying and managing services as recited in claim 10 wherein said downloaded service application is operative to provide functions for remotely controlling said particular device (Col. 7, lines 1-6, lines 11-20).

18. As per claim 12, Lortz teaches a service management software system for execution by a gateway device communicatively coupled with at least one electronic device via a home network, the software system for identifying and managing service applications associated with each of the electronic devices, wherein the service applications are directed to at least one of: remotely controlling the device, remotely diagnosing problems with the device, remotely

performing maintenance functions on the device, and providing interoperability with another device, (Col. 5, lines 15-45; Fig 3) the gateway device being operative to access the internet protocol network, comprising:

a home network bridge supported by a platform for receiving device identification information associated with a particular one of the devices in the home network for which a service application is required (Col. 4, lines 31-40, lines 63-65; Col. 8, lines 63-65);

a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator (URL) based on said device identification information (Col. 6, lines 40-67); and

an internet bridge supported by the platform and being responsive to receive said URL from said service manager via the platform, and being operative to access a server via the internet protocol network using said URL, and to download a service application associated with said particular device, wherein the platform is operative to dynamically load and unload service applications (Col. 6, lines 40-67).

22. As per claims 14-18, Claims 14-18 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 2-6 above.

23. As per claim 19, Lortz teaches a service management software system as recited in claim 14 wherein said service manager is operative to determine a search key based on said device ID information, and to pass said search key to said internet bridge for the purpose of querying said server using said search key for a service application associated with the particular device (Col. 6, lines 40-67; Col. 7, lines 1-6, lines 11-20, lines 38-57).

24. As per claim 20-28, Claims 20-28 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1-7, 10-11 above respectively.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz, US 6,505,243 in view of 'Official Notice' in example of Kelly et al. (hereinafter Kelly), US 2002/0126678.

27. As per claim 13, Lortz does not teach a service management software system as recited in claim 12 further comprising a resource manager supported by the platform and being operative to control resources of the gateway system. However 'Official Notice' is taken by the Examiner that the concept and advantages of providing for resource manager is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a resource manager with Lortz because it would provide for proper resource management in a finite resource environment. Gateway device has finite resources, thus need for a resource manager is essential to prioritize the tasks that coming in and going out of the gateway. As an illustrative example, Kelly teaches the resource management concept which is commonly known in the art at the time of the invention in the sample section of Abstract, [0017], [0031].

*Conclusion*

28. Applicant's remarks filed 07/12/2004 have been considered but are found not persuasive.

29. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Lortz fails to disclose or suggest downloading and executing anything more complex than basic installation and configuration instructions for a selected device, Lortz does not teach or suggest downloading and executing a

Art Unit: 2154

downloaded service application to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device.

In response to Applicant's amendment, Lortz teaches the above sections.

Referring to Col. 5, lines 15-45 for instance, Lortz explicitly teaches remote configuration/controlling of network devices upon downloading programs and execution of the programs thereafter.

Thus, Lortz teaches the above sections for the reasons stated above.

30. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that most if not all environments have finite resources, but it does not necessarily follow that all environments have a resource manager. In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner provided additional art in the form of Kelly et al. (hereinafter Kelly), US 2002/0126678.

Kelly teaches of resource management performed at the gateway device in form of software.

Thus Kelly teaches of an environment with finite resources, and the solution thereof is to have a resource manager in place to control resource allocation.

Applicant's remarks filed 07/12/2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds

of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is advised of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

Art Unit: 2154

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

“RESIDENTIAL GATEWAY SYSTEM FOR MANAGING SERVICE APPLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ELECTRONIC DEVICES”.

- i. US 6553376 Lewis et al.
- ii. US 6542897 Lee
- iii. US 5475835 Hickey
- iv. US 6167438 Yates et al.
- v. “An Intelligent environment must be adaptive”, Michael C. Mozer, March 1999, IEEE INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS.
- vi. “Platform for a home automation application layer design” Douligeris et al., International Journal of Mini and Microcomputers v 18 n1 1996.
- vii. “use is wide, open”, Moss, Bill, World Bus Journal, 1999.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Art Unit: 2154

CZ

October 2, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner